

REMARKS

This Amendment is responsive to the Final Office Action mailed on July 9, 2007. The Examiner's comments have been carefully considered. This Amendment is being submitted following the filing of a Request for Continued Examination (RCE).

In the Office Action, claims 23-28 and 39-44 have been rejected for reasons set forth in the Final Office Action. However, claims 45 and 46, also of record at the time of the issuance of the Final Office Action, have not been addressed or mentioned either in the Office Action summary or in the detailed text starting on page 2. In a telephone conference with Examiner Hotaling, the Examiner confirmed that claims 45 and 46 have not been addressed in the Office Action.

Claims 23-28 and 39-44, which have been rejected in the Final Office Action, have been cancelled without prejudice and new claims 47-52 are added herein. Accordingly, the original claims 45 and 46 previously of record and new claims 47-52 are now of record for examination and further consideration by the Examiner.

All the claims of record now currently recite or require a first phrase group and a plurality of second phrase groups that have the same play-by-play content as the respective first phrase groups but reported by a different announcer. A phrase switch means is provided for switching the phrase group to use from a first phrase group to a second phrase group in accordance with an external operation or a predetermined event in the game. A feature of the invention is that first, second and third commands are provided for selecting an additional phrase from a low-level first or second phrase group, selecting a phrase after switching to a low-level first or second phrase group and for not reproducing the phrase at all, respectively. The phrase selection units selects an additional

phrase from a low-level first or second phrase group designated by the first command and selects a phrase after switching to a low-level first or second phrase group designated by the second command. When a third command is issued the speech unit does not output any speech.

The only reference cited or relied by the Examiner is Japanese Publication No. JP 08-215433 to Toyama Shigeki, for the reasons outlined in the Office Action. However, clearly, the limitations originally recited in the unaddressed claims 45 and 46, and now also required by claims 47-52, are not taught or suggested in the Japanese Shigeki publication.

The claimed speech outputting game machine provides additional versatility and authenticity to the outputted speech which makes the output phrases much more spontaneous and realistic and avoid a level of repetition and, ultimately, boredom, even with the broadcasting device for games disclosed in the reference.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the claims of record 45-52 now clearly and patentably distinguish over the applied reference. Reconsideration by the Examiner and withdrawal of the rejections is, therefore, respectfully requested.

Dated: December 10, 2007

Lackebach Siegel LLP
One Chase Road
Scarsdale, New York 10583
(914) 723-4300
mgreenspan@LSLLP.com

Respectfully submitted,

By: 

Myron Greenspan
Reg. No.: 25,680